MOTION IN LIMINE TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE OF SCAR

This motion is made under Fed. R. Ev. 401, 402 and 403, and is based upon the ground that the evidence is irrelevant and that its probative value is substantially outweighed by the danger of undue prejudice to Plaintiff. This motion is further based on the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the pleadings and papers on file in this action and upon such of argument and evidence as may be presented prior to or at the hearing of this motion. Dated: June 22009 LAW OFFICES OF GREGORY A. YATES, P.C. Co-Counsel for Plaintiffs TOMAS BARRERA, SR., individually and as a Personal Representative of THE ESTATE OF TOMAS BARRERA, JR. Dated: June_1009 LAW OFFICES OF KIM SCOVIS MARIA LAZOS, individually and as a Personal Representative of THE ESTATE OF TOMAS BARRERA, JR.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I.

EVIDENCE OF A SCAR FOUND ON DECEDENT'S ARM SHOULD BE EXCLUDED AS BEING NOT RELEVANT AND HIGHLY PREJUDICIAL

There is no evidence to suggest that the decedent was under the influence prior to being shot. More importantly, there is no evidence that drug use was a factor in the decision to shoot decedent. Admitting evidence of a scar found on in decedent's arm will not prove or disprove any fact necessary to this action and will add absolutely nothing significant or valuable to the evidence. F.R.E. 401 and 402.

While admitting such evidence has no probative value, it would be highly prejudicial, as it would depict decedent as a drug user and will arouse the jury's prejudice, hostility and antipathy. *See* <u>United States v. Blackstone</u>, 56 F.3d 1143, 1145-46 (9th Cir. 1995) (trial court abused its discretion by admitting evidence of narcotics recipes that were found in the defendant's vehicle and expert testimony regarding drug-trafficking, because, to the extent that the evidence was relevant, it was unfairly prejudicial and highly inflammatory); <u>Lucero v. Donovan</u>, 354 F.2d 16, 22 (9th Cir.1965 (trial court erred by admitting expert testimony that plaintiff was a narcotics user based upon a scar on her arm, because the evidence was not proper for impeachment and was irrelevant and prejudicial).

Allowing the evidence will prolong this trial and waste the valuable time and resources of the Court and all other participants, while adding absolutely nothing significant or valuable to the evidence.

23 | ///

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24 ///

25 | ///

26 | ///

27 1 ///

28 ///

1	II.
2	<u>CONCLUSION</u>
3	Based on the above, it is respectfully requested that the Court exclude any and
4	all evidence, testimony, references to testimony/evidence or argument, relating to a
5	scar found on decedent's arm.
6	
7	Dated: June 25 2009 LAW OFFICES OF GREGORY A. YATES, P.C.
8	Thomas of 11
9	GREGORY A. YATES/ Co-Counsel for Plaintiffs,
10	TOMAS BARRERA, SR., individually and as a Personal Representative of THE ESTATE OF TOMAS BARRERA, JR.
11	TOMAS BARRERA, JR.
12	Dated: June 2009 LAW OFFICES OF KIM SCOVIS
13	
14	JENNY SEOVIS Counsel for Plaintiff,
15 16	MARÍA LAZOS, individually and as a Personal Representative of THE ESTATE OF TOMAS BARRERA, JR.
17	,
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	MOTION IN LIMINE TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE OF SCAR
28	-4-